

# **APPENDIX B:**

## **Budget Prioritization Process**

The budget prioritization process includes general prioritization scoring from a Department-wide point of view (Resource Issues (up to 200 points), Department Activities (up to 200 points), and Strategic Objectives (up to 100 points), as well as specific scoring involving technical review, and Prioritization Committee evaluation and scoring of the applications.

### Technical Review

Technical Review scores are based on input from Department staff with expertise and experience in technical subjects identified with the proposal. Applications are reviewed for Benefit, Feasibility, and Merit, using the Federal-Aid Enhancement Review Form for a maximum 100 points, scored in 25-point increments. An average of the reviewer scores is included in the composite score when the Prioritization Process Committee evaluates applications. The staff review is completed in the months of February, March, and April; thereafter the applications evaluated and scored by the respective Budget Prioritization Committee. The committee scoring is as follows:

### Feasibility and Benefits

Each application is evaluated based on several feasibility and benefit questions. The score for feasibility and benefits is worth up to 150 points of the application's score. There are four questions that apply to all project areas that are worth 80 points. The remaining 70 points apply specifically to Boater Access issues.

### Merit

Each proposal is evaluated based on several questions of the proposal's merit. Merit is worth up to 150 points of the applications score.

### Cost

A series of specific funding source questions is asked of each proposal on 1) requested funding in relation to expected benefit, 2) match and in-kind contribution funding in the total project cost, and 3) percent share of funding requested compared to the amount of available funds. The score for cost is worth up to 100 points.

### Final Score-Sheet

In addition to the Rating Resources and Rating Department Activities and Strategic Plan Comparison scores discussed above, specific Technical Review scores, Feasibility and Benefit scores, and Cost scores are compiled and included on the final score sheet.

## FEDERAL-AID ENHANCEMENT REVIEW FORM

### REGIONAL, ENGINEERING, NONGAME AND HABITAT PROJECT PROPOSAL TECHNICAL REVIEW

Please provide comments on this proposed project consistent with your area of expertise. Comments may discuss the importance of the proposal, the support (or lack of) from the local community, the key personnel, the funding, or any information you believe would help the Prioritization Committee score the application. The Boating Facilities Section will address general administrative review matters per Federal Aid Guidelines and Department Policy.

You may write or type on this hard copy form or you can access the form by: U:/Development Branch/Boating Access/TM Comment Form.

Please return the review by inter-office mail or e-mail to Ron Christofferson (SSDV). The due date will be announced.

Project Title:		Person(s) Commenting:	
Region No. _____ Engineering _____ Nongame _____ Habitat _____		Date: _____	
<b>CHECK ONE:</b> _____ I strongly support funding this project as written. (Please explain) _____ I support funding this project as written. (Please explain) _____ I support funding this project with reservations. (Please explain) _____ I support funding this project only if the following stipulations are applied. (List) _____ I recommend against funding this project. (Please explain)		<b>VALUE:</b> 100 Points 75 Points 50 Points 25 Points 0 Points	

Comments: (Attach additional sheets, if necessary)

**Feasibility** -- maximum 150 points (i.e., 80 points for questions 1 through 4, 70 points total for each project fund.) Use score values in the range as shown in the question (or item) with reference to the criteria presented.

1. Are the project accomplishments and deliverables stated clearly? **0 – 15 points**

- 15 clearly stated and realistic
- 0 Unclear

2. As stated, could the project be completed within the time allotted? **0 – 15 points**

- 15 realistic time schedule
- 0 time schedule not realistic

3. Are key project personnel/managers adequately qualified? **0 – 30 points**

- 30 well qualified
- 15 qualifications insufficiently stated
- 0 no evidence of qualified personnel

4. Evaluate the applicant's track record. **0 – 20 points**

- 20 in good standing or new applicant
- 10 minor out-of-compliance record or minor delinquent reporting
- 0 evidence of failure to terms of agreement

**BOATING ACCESS -- maximum 70 points**

1. Does the proposed project meet the criteria of the management objectives for this body of water?  
**0 – 10 points**

10 Yes  
0 No

2. Is the site suitable for the design, construction and maintenance of the project as proposed? **0 – 10 points**

10 Yes  
0 No

3. Upon completion of this project, will the new access (previously unavailable) be available for more than one user group? **0 – 10 points**

10 yes, with ADA-compliant availability for limited mobility persons  
5 yes, but not handicap accessible  
0 no, limited access

4. Will access be available 24 hours per day, 365 days a year, notwithstanding temporary closures to protect the project from damage due to wet weather, fire danger, or other unforeseen conditions? **0 – 10 points**

10 year around access  
5 seasonal closures  
0 not addressed

5. If applicable, are long-term maintenance issues adequately addressed? **0 – 10 points**

10 yes or not applicable  
5 not thoroughly  
0 not addressed

6. Is the enhancement expected to result in an increase in gasoline powered boating recreation opportunities? **0 – 10 points**

10 Yes  
0 No

7. Will the enhancement encourage new users? (other types of watercrafts, recreation, watchable wildlife, etc.) **0 – 10 points**

10 Yes  
0 No

**MERIT Total Points – 150** Use score values in the range as shown in the question (or item) with reference to the criteria presented.

1. Will Arizona wildlife and/or habitat be able to utilize and/or benefit directly from the project's end products? **0 – 20 points**
  - 20 strongly benefits wildlife and/or habitats
  - 10 somewhat benefits wildlife and/or wildlife
  - 0 no apparent benefits
2. Does the project proposal support, supplement, or enhance an ongoing job or project? **0 – 20 points**
  - 20 strongly aligns with job(s) or project(s)
  - 10 somewhat aligns with job(s) or project(s)
  - 0 no apparent alignment
3. Does the project address a preferred project list or sensitive element objective? **0 – 30 points**
  - 30 strongly correlates to a preferred project list or sensitive elements list
  - 15 somewhat correlates
  - 0 no apparent correlation
4. Is the publicity plan adequate? **0 – 30 points**
  - 30 gives credit to funding source(s) and provides high visibility for AGFD
  - 15 credits funding source or AGFD, but visibility not adequate
  - 0 inadequate publicity plan
5. Has the applicant provided documentation that the proposal has been reviewed? **0 – 30 points**
  - 30 thoroughly reviewed and documentation of strong support
  - 15 evidence of review and/or community support
  - 0 no review or support indicated
6. Are potential negative side effects (e.g. public safety, resource impact or planning conflicts) recognized? **0 – 20 points**
  - 20 thoroughly identified a range of effects
  - 10 inadequately evaluated potential effects
  - 0 none identified

**COST Total Points – 100** Use score values in the range as shown in the question (or item) with reference to the criteria presented.

1. Is the amount of the funding requested justified by direct benefits to Arizona wildlife, habitat and/or the Department? **0 – 40 points**
  - 40 expected benefits exceed requested funding (benefit greater than 200 percent )
  - 20 expected benefits exceed requested funding (benefit greater than 150 to 200 percent )
  - 10 expected benefits justify requested funding (100 to 150 percent benefit)
  - 0 requested funding excessive with very little, if any, expected benefits (less than 100 percent benefit)
2. Evaluate cost sharing by percentage of total project cost. Compare requested dollar amount to match and substantiated donation on Estimated Project Cost Sheet.  
**0 – 30 points**
  - 30 match plus donation greater than 75 percent of total project cost
  - 20 match plus donation 50 to 75 percent of total project cost
  - 10 match plus donation greater than 25 but less than 50 percent of total project cost
  - 5 match plus donation greater than zero to 25 percent of total project cost
  - 0 requested funding only, no match or donation
3. Percent of the cost of the project compared to the available funds.  
**0 – 30 points**
  - 30 requested funds 0 to 20 percent of funds available
  - 20 requested funds 21 to 40 percent of funds available
  - 10 requested funds 41 to 50 percent of funds available
  - 0 requested funds more than 50 percent of funds available

<b>Project Title:</b>			
<b>Proposal Number:</b>		<b>Applicant:</b>	
<b>Funding Source:</b>		<b>Available Funds:</b>	
<b>Amount of funding requested:</b>			
<b>Rating Criteria</b>	<b>Points</b>	<b>Weight</b>	<b>Weighted Points</b>
Resource Issue (up to 200 weighted points) List Resource:		<b>2.0</b>	
Department Activities (up to 200 weighted points) list activity:		<b>2.0</b>	
Strategic Plan Objectives (up to 100 points)		<b>1.0</b>	
Technical Review (up to 100 points)		<b>1.0</b>	
Feasibility/Benefits (up to 150 points)		<b>1.0</b>	
Merit (up to 150 points)		<b>1.0</b>	
Cost (up to 100 points)		<b>1.0</b>	
Total score			

This proposal was scored by: (Please sign and date)

Name:	date
Name:	date
Name:	date
Name:	date

Remarks or Special Consideration(s).